



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,054	06/27/2003	Michael L.F. Chan	TRA-007	7895
3897	7590	03/06/2009	EXAMINER	
SCHNECK & SCHNECK P.O. BOX 2-E SAN JOSE, CA 95109-0005			MILLER, BENA B	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3725		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		03/06/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte MICHAEL L. F. CHAN

Application 10/608,054
Technology Center 3700

Mailed: March 05, 2009

Before KRISTA ZELE *Deputy Chief Appeals Administrator.*

ZELE, *Deputy Chief Appeals Administrator.*

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on July 28, 2008. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter(s) requiring attention prior to docketing.

EXAMINER'S ANSWER, GROUNDS OF REJECTION

A review of the file indicates that the Examiner's Answer filed December 28, 2006 does not comply with the guidelines provided in MPEP § 1207.02 because it refers, either directly or indirectly, to a prior Office action without fully restating the point relied upon in the answer. If there is a complete and thorough development of the issues in a prior action, the examiner may copy any referenced prior rejection(s) from the prior Office action into the examiner's answer. The examiner is reminded to reevaluate his or her prior position in light of the arguments presented in the brief, and should expressly withdraw any rejections not adhered to in the "Grounds of Rejection Withdrawn" section of the examiner's answer.

Therefore, a substitute examiner's answer which fully restates any prior points relied upon in the answer, is required. See also Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 1207.02 (8th ed. Rev. 6, Sept 2007) for details.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the application be returned to the Examiner:

- 1) acknowledge the appeal brief filed January 16,2007
- 2) to vacate the Examiner's Answer mailed December 28, 2006
- 3) to generate a new Examiner's Answer which does not refer directly or

indirectly to a prior Office action without fully restating the point relied on in the answer; and

4) such further action as may be required.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797

KZ/jgr

SCHNECK & SCHNECK
P.O. BOX 2-E
SAN JOSE CA 95109-0005